UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/786,752	02/25/2004	Christopher E. Bales	ORACL-01373US0	2980

80548   7590   10/15/2008
Fliesler Meyer LLP
650 California Street
14th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94108

EXAMINER
KEATON, SHERROD L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2175	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/15/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	**Applicant(s)**
Office Action Summary	10/786,752	BALES ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	Sherrod Keaton	2175	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS,
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>01 July 2008</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-64</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-64</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>9/2008</u>.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to the filing on 7-01-08. Claims 1-64 are pending and have

been considered below:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2.   Claims 1, 2, 8, 9, 12-18, 24, 27-33, 39, 40, 43-49, 55, 56, 59-64are rejected

under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Anuff et al. ("Anuff",US</u>

<u>2002/0029296 A1)</u> in view of <u>Gonzales (US 20020161603 A1).</u>

<u>Claims 1, 32 and 48:</u> <u>Anuff</u> discloses an interactive tool, method and machine

readable medium for configuring a portal, comprising:

a.) Wherein the interactive tool is implemented using at least one processor;

 a first user interface operable to define and/or manage the portal (Page 1, Paragraph

6);

b.) a second user interface operable to define and/or manage entitlements for at least one portal resource (Page 1, Paragraph 7);

c.) wherein the portal can include at least one of the following portal resources: a desktop, a book, a page, a portlet, a shell, a look and feel, and a layout (Page 1, Column 7), (Page 4, Paragraph 66); and

d.) wherein the first user interface includes a context-sensitive editor (Page 4, Column 63-64).

But Anuff does not explicitly disclose wherein the second user interface is adapted to create roles the second interface including a hierarchy pane that allows for the selection of a role and an editor pane that allows for the creation of a new role which is added to the hierarchy pane under the selected role. However Gonzales discloses a content manager and further discloses a user interface which allows for the creation of roles which can be added into navigational hierarchy (Page 2, Paragraph 36 and Page 5, Paragraph 92). Here administrator provides roles for sections within the hierarchy. Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide creation of in roles in Anuff as taught by Gonzales. One would have been motivated to add roles to provide improved operability of the system wherein administrator could provide certain accesses to multiple users.

Claims 2, 33, and 49: Anuff and Gonzales disclose an interactive tool, method and machine readable medium for configuring a portal as in claims 1, 32, and 48 above and

further discloses that at least one user interface operable to define and/or manage one of: a desktop, a book, a page, a portlet, a shell, a theme, a menu, a look and feel, and a layout (Anuff: Page 1, Column 7; Page 4, Paragraph 66).

Claims 8, 39, and 55: <u>Anuff and Gonzales</u> disclose an interactive tool, method and machine readable medium for configuring a portal as in claims 1, 32, and 48 above and further discloses an entitlement determines what capabilities are available to a portal visitor for the at least one resources (Anuff: Page 5, Paragraph 76).

Claims 9, 40, and 56: <u>Anuff and Gonzales</u> disclose an interactive tool, method and machine readable medium for configuring a portal as in claims 1, 32, and 48 above and further discloses that the entitlement is based on a user role (Anuff: Page 2 and 3, Paragraph 26).

Claims 12, 43, and 59: <u>Anuff and Gonzales</u> disclose an interactive tool, method and machine readable medium for configuring a portal as in claims 1, 32, and 48 above and further discloses that a portlet can dynamically present content (Anuff: Page 2, Paragraph 26; Page 3, Paragraph 51).

Claims 13, 44, and 60: <u>Anuff and Gonzales</u> disclose an interactive tool, method and machine readable medium for configuring a portal as in claims 1, 32, and 48 above and

further discloses a fourth user interface operable to define and/or manage personalization of the portal (Anuff: Page 3, Paragraph 51; Page 4, Paragraph 56).

Claims 14, 45, and 61: <u>Anuff and Gonzales</u> disclose an interactive tool, method and machine readable medium for configuring a portal as in claim 13 above and further discloses that the fourth user interface is operable to define and/or manage a content placeholder (Anuff: Pages 4 and 5, Paragraph 55, 65-72).

Claims 15, 46, and 62: <u>Anuff and Gonzales</u> disclose an interactive tool, method and machine readable medium for configuring a portal as in claim 13 above and further discloses that the fourth user interface is operable to define and/or manage a content selector (Anuff: Page 4, Paragraph 56).

Claims 16, 47, and 63: <u>Anuff and Gonzales</u> disclose an interactive tool, method and machine readable medium for configuring a portal as in claims 1, 32, and 48 above and further discloses that a fifth user interface operable to define and/or manage delegated administration (Anuff: Page 5, Paragraph 73-79).

Claim 17: <u>Anuff</u> discloses an interactive tool for configuring a portal, comprising:

a.) Wherein the interactive tool is implemented using at least one processor.

a first user interface operable to define and/or manage the portal (Page 1, Paragraph 6);

b.) a second user interface operable to define and/or manage entitlements for at least

one portal resource (Page 1, Paragraph 7);

c.) wherein the portal can include at least one of the following portal resources: a

desktop, a book, a page, a portlet, a shell, a look and feel, and a layout (Page 1,

Column 7), (Page 4, Paragraph 66); and

d.) wherein an entitlement determines what capabilities are available to a portal visitor

for the at least one resources (Page 5, Paragraph 76);

e.) wherein the first user interface includes a context-sensitive editor (Page 4, Column

63-64).

But Anuff does not explicitly disclose wherein the second user interface is adapted to

create roles the second interface including a hierarchy pane that allows for the selection

of a role and an editor pane that allows for the creation of a new role which is added to

the hierarchy pane under the selected role. However Gonzales discloses a content

manager and further discloses a user interface which allows for the creation of roles

which can be added into navigational hierarchy (Page 2, Paragraph 36 and Page 5,

Paragraph 92). Here administrator provides roles for sections within the hierarchy.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time

of the invention to provide creation of in roles in Anuff as taught by Gonzales. One

would have been motivated to add roles to provide improved operability of the system

wherein administrator could provide certain accesses to multiple users.

Claim 18: <u>Anuff and Gonzales</u> disclose an interactive tool for configuring a portal as in claim 17 above and further discloses that at least one user interface operable to define and/or manage one of: a desktop, a book, a page, a portlet, a shell, a theme, a menu, a look and feel, and a layout (Anuff: Page 1, Column 7; Page 4, Paragraph 66).

Claim 24: <u>Anuff and Gonzales</u> disclose an interactive tool for configuring a portal as in claim 17 above and further discloses that the entitlement is based on a user role (Anuff: Page 2 and 3, Paragraph 26).

Claim 27: <u>Anuff and Gonzales</u> disclose an interactive tool for configuring a portal as in claim 17 above and further discloses that a portlet can dynamically present content (Anuff: Page 2, Paragraph 26; Page 3, Paragraph 51).

Claim 28: <u>Anuff and Gonzales</u> disclose an interactive tool for configuring a portal as in claim 17 above and further discloses a fourth user interface operable to define and/or manage personalization of the portal (Anuff: Page 3, Paragraph 51; Page 4, Paragraph 56).

Claim 29: <u>Anuff and Gonzales</u> disclose an interactive tool for configuring a portal as in claim 28 above and further discloses that the fourth user interface is operable to define and/or manage a content placeholder (Anuff: Pages 4 and 5, Paragraph 55, 65-72).

Claim 30: <u>Anuff and Gonzales</u> disclose an interactive tool for configuring a portal as in claim 28 above and further discloses that the fourth user interface is operable to define and/or manage a content selector (Anuff: Page 4, Paragraph 56).

Claim 31: <u>Anuff and Gonzales</u> disclose an interactive tool for configuring a portal as in claim 17 above and further discloses that a fifth user interface operable to define and/or manage delegated administration (Anuff: Page 5, Paragraph 73-79).

Claim 64: <u>Anuff</u> discloses a computer readable storage medium comprising:

a.) a code segment including instructions to provide a first user interface operable to define and/or manage the portal (Page 1, Paragraph 6);

b.) a code segment including instructions to provide a second user interface operable to define and/or manage entitlements for at least one portal resource (Page 1, Paragraph 7); and

c.) wherein the portal can include at least one of the following portal resources: a desktop, a book, a page, a portlet, a shell, a look and feel, and a layout (Page 1, Column 7), (Page 4, Paragraph 66).

But Anuff does not explicitly disclose wherein the second user interface is adapted to create roles the second interface including a hierarchy pane that allows for the selection of a role and an editor pane that allows for the creation of a new role which is added to the hierarchy pane under the selected role. However Gonzales discloses a content manager and further discloses a user interface which allows for the creation of roles which can be added into navigational hierarchy (Page 2, Paragraph 36 and Page 5, Paragraph 92). Here administrator provides roles for sections within the hierarchy. Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide creation of in roles in Anuff as taught by Gonzales. One would have been motivated to add roles to provide improved operability of the system wherein administrator could provide certain accesses to multiple users.

3.   Claims 3-5, 10, 19-21, 25, 34-36, 41, 50-52, and 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anuff et al. ("Anuff",US 2002/0029296 A1) and Gonzales (US 20020161603 A1) as applied to Claim 1, 32 and 48 above in further view of Sollenberger et al. ("Sollenberger", US 2002/0152279 A1).

 Claims 3, 34, and 50: <u>Anuff and Gonzales</u> disclose an interactive tool, method, and a computer readable medium as in the interactive tool of claims 1, 32 and 48 above but do not specifically disclose a desktop that can be defined based on a template. However <u>Sollenberger</u> discloses a personalized intranet portal and further discloses a desktop application (Page 1, Paragraph 5). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary in the art at the time of the invention to include a template for the desktop application of <u>Sollenberger</u> with the already existing templates of the modified <u>Anuff.</u> One would have been motivated to have a desktop based on a template to give novel users some guidance thereby improving the user-friendliness.

 Claims 4, 35, and 51: <u>Anuff and Gonzales</u> disclose an interactive tool, method, and a computer readable medium as in the interactive tool of claims 1, 32 and 48 above but do not disclose a desktop is a user-specific view of a portal. <u>Sollenberger</u> discloses that the user can customize sections of the intranet portal (abstract and Figures showing "My Portal"). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the modified <u>Anuff</u> to allow the user to customize sections of the intranet portal as taught by <u>Sollenberger</u>. One would have been motivated to allow the user to customize sections of the intranet portal in order for the portal to correspond to the users particular needs and requirements.

 Claims 5, 36, and 52: <u>Anuff and Gonzales</u> disclose an interactive tool, method, and a computer readable medium as in the interactive tool of claims 1, 32 and 48 above but

do not specifically disclose providing a third user interface operable to define and/or

manage a desktop; and wherein the third user interface can render a preview of the

desktop. However <u>Sollenberger</u> discloses a personalized intranet portal and further

discloses designing a desktop as defined by the user and previewing the display (Page

5, Paragraph 42-44). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary in

the art at the time of the invention to provide an interface for defining the desktop and

for previewing in the modified <u>Anuff </u>as taught by <u>Sollenberger.</u> One would have been

motivated to include the interface because a user may need to see if the layout

selected accommodates the space allotted.

<u>Claims 10,41, and 57:</u> <u>Anuff and Gonzales</u> disclose the interactive tool of claims 1, 32

and 48 above, and further discloses wherein content is part of a virtual content

repository (VCR) (Anuff: paragraph 0024) [A collection of web pages that relate to a

common topic and re interlinked with one another may form a web site], but do not

disclose a third user interface operable to define and/or manage content. <u>Sollenberger</u>

discloses the user adding, removing or rearranging modules in that section (Abstract,

lines 8-10). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art

at the time of the invention for the modified <u>Anuff</u> to permit the user adding, removing or

rearranging modules as taught by <u>Sollenberger</u>. One would have been motivated to

permit the user adding, removing or rearranging modules in order to customize the

portal.

Claim 19: Anuff and Gonzales disclose an interactive tool, as in the interactive tool of claim 17 above but do not disclose a desktop that can be defined based on a template. However Sollenberger discloses a personalized intranet portal and further discloses a desktop application (Page 1, Paragraph 5). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary in the art at the time of the invention to include a template for the desktop application of Sollenberger with the already existing templates of the modified Anuff. One would have been motivated to have a desktop based on a template to give novel users some guidance thereby improving the user-friendliness.

Claim 20: Anuff and Gonzales disclose an interactive tool, as in the interactive tool of claim 17 above but do not disclose a desktop is a user-specific view of a portal. Sollenberger discloses that the user can customize sections of the intranet portal (abstract and Figures showing "My Portal"). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the modified Anuff to allow the user to customize sections of the intranet portal as taught by Sollenberger. One would have been motivated to allow the user to customize sections of the intranet portal in order for the portal to correspond to the users particular needs and requirements.

Claim 21: Anuff and Gonzales disclose an interactive tool, as in the interactive tool of claim 17 above but do not specifically disclose providing a third user interface operable

to define and/or manage a desktop; and wherein the third user interface can render a preview of the desktop. However Sollenberger discloses a personalized intranet portal and further discloses designing a desktop as defined by the user and previewing the display (Page 5, Paragraph 42-44). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary in the art at the time of the invention to provide an interface for defining the desktop and for previewing in the modified Anuff as taught by Sollenberger. One would have been motivated to include the interface because a user may need to see if the layout selected accommodates the space allotted.

Claim 25: Anuff and Gonzales disclose the interactive tool as in claim 17 above, and further discloses wherein content is part of a virtual content repository (VCR) (Anuff: paragraph 0024) [A collection of web pages that relate to a common topic and re interlinked with one another may form a web site], but do not disclose a third user interface operable to define and/or manage content. Sollenberger discloses the user adding, removing or rearranging modules in that section (Abstract, lines 8-10). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the modified Anuff to permit the user adding, removing or rearranging modules as taught by Sollenberger. One would have been motivated to permit the user adding, removing or rearranging modules in order to customize the portal.

4.   Claims 6, 7, 11, 22, 23, 26, 37, 38, 42, 53, 54, and 58 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Anuff (US 2002/0029296 A1) and Gonzales</u>

<u>(US 20020161603 A1)</u> as applied to Claims 1, 32 and 48 above in further view of <u>Parker</u>

<u>(The Complete Idiots Guide to Microsoft FrontPage 2000).</u>

Claims 6, 7, 37, 38, 53, and 54: <u>Anuff and Gonzales</u> disclose the interactive tool of

claims 1, 32 and 48 but do not disclose that the interface includes a hierarchy browser

and that the portal can be depicted graphically as a hierarchy of the at least one portal

resources. However, <u>Parker</u> discloses the FrontPage application window with webpage

resources displayed in a hierarchical manner (page 7, figure). Therefore, it would have

been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the

modified <u>Anuff</u> to depict the webpage (portal) graphically with the application window

showing the webpage resources in a hierarchical manner. One would have been

motivated to depict the webpage (portal) graphically with the application window

showing the webpage resources in a hierarchical manner to be able to view and

manipulate the resources at different levels of abstraction.

Claims 11, 42, and 58: <u>Anuff and Gonzales</u> disclose the interactive tool of claim 10

above but do not disclose that the third user interface allows a user to modify the VCR

by dragging and dropping graphical objects representing VCR nodes. <u>Parker</u> discloses

the drag and drop operation (page 52, "Try Drag and Drop"). Therefore, it would have

been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for

modified <u>Anuff</u> to support drag and drop of objects to modify the VCR. One would
have been motivated to support drag and drop of objects to modify the VCR because
this is a common method in the computer arts field for adding members to a collection.

Claims 22 and 23: <u>Anuff and Gonzales</u> disclose the interactive tool of claims 17 above
but do not disclose that the interface includes a hierarchy browser and that the portal
can be depicted graphically as a hierarchy of the at least one portal resources.
However, <u>Parker</u> discloses the FrontPage application window with webpage resources
displayed in a hierarchical manner (page 7, figure). Therefore, it would have been
obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the
modified <u>Anuff</u> to depict the webpage (portal) graphically with the application window
showing the webpage resources in a hierarchical manner. One would have been
motivated to depict the webpage (portal) graphically with the application window
showing the webpage resources in a hierarchical manner to be able to view and
manipulate the resources at different levels of abstraction.

Claim 26: <u>Anuff and Gonzales</u> disclose the interactive tool of claim 25 wherein: the third
user interface allows a user to modify the VCR by dragging and dropping graphical
objects representing VCR nodes. <u>Parker</u> discloses the drag and drop operation (page
52, "Try Drag and Drop"). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary
skill in the art at the time of the invention for the modified <u>Anuff</u> to support drag and drop
of objects to modify the VCR. One would have been motivated to support drag and

drop of objects to modify the VCR because this is a common method in the computer

arts field for adding members to a collection.

Response to Arguments

5.   Applicant's arguments have been considered but are not persuasive. Applicant

has argued that Gonzales does not disclose an editor pane that creates new roles,

however examiner points to (Page 5, Paragraph 92) which discloses that user is

provided a workspace, this workspace is embodied is some type of graphical window or

pane and allows user to make their edits and selections, therefore they are provided an

editor pane. Additionally user is allowed to create roles within the LOB hierarchy (Page

2, Paragraph 36) this is considered to be a creation of a new role within that hierarchy.

Applicants has not clearly disclosed what they entail by a new role, so if applicant

proposes that this role is newly created without any previous similar role associations,

applicant is invited to include the claim language to further clarify the claim.

Conclusion

Applicants amendments necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this office

action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from

the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date

of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH

shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action

is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX

MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

　　　Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be

　　　directed to Sherrod Keaton whose telephone number is 571 270-1697. The examiner can normally

　　　be reached on Mon. thru Fri. and alternating Fri. off (EST).

　　　　　If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor,

William Bashore can be reached on 571-272-4088. The fax phone number for the organization where this

application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-3800.

　　　Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application

　　　Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained

　　　from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available

　　　through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-

　　　direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the

　　　Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

　　　USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-

　　　786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SLK

10-9-08

　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　/WILLIAM L. BASHORE/
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2175